



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The result is a wholly distorted perspective of Hazlitt, who, of all the group that set the pattern of the new essay, was the most modern, owed least to the older models, and had the greatest influence upon later writers. Finally, any presentation of Hazlitt as essayist that leaves wholly out of account his relationship to Montaigne and to Rousseau is at least inadequate.

It must be apparent that to the student of literary history who wishes accurate information upon the development of the essay as a type, Professor Walker's work can be of little service. But the reader who is concerned only with the single essayists and is little interested in origins and relations will find the volume very attractive. The appreciations of the individual essayists are evidently derived from Professor Walker's own interested though not always analytical reading of the essays themselves, and they have, accordingly, the merit of freshness and originality. The style is delightfully readable, and there is throughout a pleasing absence of any *ex cathedra* manner. The reader of essays will find in the volume much to revive the charm of what he has enjoyed, and he will be tempted to follow Professor Walker's example and browse widely in one of the most interesting fields of English literature.

W. F. BRYAN.

Northwestern University.

Mixed Preterites in German. By O. P. REIN, Ph. D., Assistant Professor in the University of North Carolina. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1915. [*Hesperia*: *Schriften zur germanischen Philologie*, no. 5.]

The lengthened forms of the strong preterites in German like *sahe*, *schuf* for *sah*, *schuf*, though familiar to every reader of older German literature, have until recently received scant attention from the grammarians, and only off-hand explanations of their origin, based on insufficient evidence, have been given. Professor Rein, in a recent volume of Collitz' valuable series *Hesperia*, presents the results of a scholarly and practically exhaustive study of these forms, and tries to account for their origin so far as the evidence will permit.

Leaving out of account the form *antfunda* of Heliand 2017,

which arose under peculiar circumstances, the oldest examples of strong preterites in *-e* are found in a fragment of a creed of the eleventh century: *das er geboren wart und gefangen wart, unt daz er irstarbe . . . daz er . . . ze himile fuore*. The occurrences up to the fourteenth century the author classifies as "exceptional instances"; but he has unearthed a considerable number of them, so many, in fact, that it seems strange that they have been so little noticed. It is true that there might be a difference of opinion as to the admissibility of some of the cases listed. It is, for instance, not clear why several occurrences of *zogete* are included, as M. H. G. *zogen*, O. H. G. *zogōn* must be regarded as a weak verb, quite distinct from *ziehen*. One of the difficulties with which the author naturally had to contend, was that of distinguishing between indicative and subjunctive. This, of course, is not always possible, but as the conjunction *ē* was in M. H. G. generally used with the subjunctive, it would seem to have been safer to regard strong preterites in *-e* after *ē* as subjunctives, unless the root-vowel clearly showed them to be indicatives. But there is included in the list from the *Speculum Ecclesiae*: *ē aber von sinen iungirn schiede, so getroste er si*; also *Parzival* 101.14 ff:

ahzeheniu maner durchstochen sach
und mit swerten zerhouwen,
ē er schiede von der frouwen,

and similar cases. Most of the cases cited, however, are incontestably strong preterite indicative forms in *-e*, and they become more and more numerous in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, from which the author has carefully examined a vast mass of literature. During the sixteenth century the usage is common in all parts of Germany, but its height is reached in the seventeenth century. Stems ending in old *-h* show the greatest tendency to take the epenthetical *-e*, e. g. *sahe, flohe, geschahe*, and the grammarian Schottel apparently uses the *-e* only with such stems. But many other stems have the lengthened forms with more or less frequency, such as *kame, nahme, triebe, gabe, schriebe, hube, liefe, verlore, fuhre, fiele, zoge, floge, gienge, ware*, etc. During the eighteenth century the lengthened forms become less frequent, and toward the end of the century they disappear rapidly; Goethe uses them only in his early writings. After 1800 few such forms are found, and these are used chiefly by writers affecting an archaic style. The

two forms which survive longest are *sahe* and *wurde*. The former was still given in the much-respected dictionary of Adelung (1774 and 1793) and even in Campe's dictionary (1810) as the only form of the preterite of *sehen*, but it has since gone out of use; *wurde*, on the other hand, has survived and has largely driven out *ward*, though in consequence of a slight semantic difference which has sprung up between the two forms, they will probably continue side by side in higher diction.

In explanation of the origin of the lengthened forms several distinct influences have been suggested. (1) That of the weak verbs: *sahe* = *lobte*. This has been accepted by several grammarians as a sufficient explanation, and the imperatives of strong verbs in *-e* on the model of those of weak verbs have been cited as an analogous case: *siehe* = *lobe*. The strong verbs in *-t* have been mentioned as those from which this influence might more especially have proceeded: *borste*, *schalte* = *lobte*. On the basis of this explanation these forms may be called "mixed preterites." (2) The influence of the subjunctive. This could not have been strong in any case, as the subjunctive is used so much less than the indicative. (3) The influence of the present tense: *sahe* = *sehe*. This would at most apply to the first person, not to the third; but as far as Professor Rein's lists show, there is no evidence that the epenthetical *-e* was found first and more often in the first person; rather the contrary. In general, the present tense of strong verbs seems to have reacted little upon the preterite; for instance, forms like *gabst* for *gab* on the analogy of *gibt* are extremely rare. (4) In the verbs ending in a media, the desire to prevent the change to the tenuis if the media became final: *warde* for *wart*. As purpose is known to play a minimal part in the creation of linguistic forms, all that could possibly be claimed on this score is that of two existing forms *warde* and *wart* the former was preferred because it agreed with the present tense in the matter of the *d*. But it would not explain the genesis of *warde*, nor throw any light on the numerous *kame*, *verlore*, etc. Besides, German is full of sound-interchanges like *d*: *t*, *b*: *p*, etc., though the common orthography conceals them in many cases. (5) The influence of doublet forms in dialects which generally drop final *-e*. The existence of pairs of interchangeable forms like *wolt*: *wolte* would easily produce uncertainty in regard to the use of final *-e*, and

might result in its appearance in places where it formerly did not occur. This is theoretically a plausible explanation, as many similar things have occurred; we need only think of the frequent assimilation of *-nd-* into *-nn-*, which resulted in the doublet forms of the present participle *gebende*: *gebenne*, which, reacting on the infinitive *ze gebenne*, produced the form *ze gebende*.

Bearing in mind how often a linguistic phenomenon is due to a combination of circumstances rather than to any one cause, Professor Rein wisely accepts no one of these explanations to the exclusion of the others. It would be strange indeed if the same circumstances which caused the earliest sporadic appearances of the epenthetical *-e* in the eleventh century, were also responsible for its rapid spread in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in spite of the great changes that had taken place in the language in the intervening centuries. In the oldest period, as soon as the vowels of the verbal endings had all been reduced to *e*, the first and third singular of the strong preterites, having no endings at all, must have appeared as abnormal forms, and a tendency to normalize them by giving them an *-e* in accordance with other forms of similar function must have made itself felt. The application of the principle was held in check, however, by the natural conservatism of the language, especially potent in the strong verbs owing to the frequent occurrence of many of them. Later, owing to the confusion caused by the divergence of the literary language from the native speech of many writers, especially in the South, the use of the *-e* greatly increased, until the standard language had become sufficiently normalized and had become sufficiently familiar in all parts of the country, when the forms with *-e* gradually vanished, with the exception of *wurde*, which has become definitely established. Professor Rein clearly and interestingly sets forth the details of these processes.

Only the mixed preterites of the type of *sahe* are discussed; no mention is made of two other interesting types. In late M. H. G. there are occasionally found forms of the second singular preterite of weak verbs, showing the usual *-t*, but the root-vowel and the ending of a strong verb; instead of the common *du brähtest* we find *du brähte* on the model of *du wære*, e. g.,

du were mir unbekant

sit du die wilden wurme brehte her in dis lant.

Wolfdietrich 792.

On the other hand in Modern Alemannian and Bavarian preterite subjunctives of strong verbs in *-t* are of frequent occurrence. Gott-helf uses *ich kämt, nähmt, rüft*, etc.; Rosegger writes: *wans na koani weiba gabad* = *wenns nur keine weiber gäbe*.

H. C. G. VON JAGEMANN.

Harvard University.

Essai sur l'évolution des doctrines de M. Georges Sorel, par FREDERIC D. CHEYDLEUR. (Thèse présentée pour le doctorat.) Université de Grenoble, 1914.

In the *mouvement des idées* in France during the two pregnant decades preceding the war, Sorel was a salient and symptomatic, if not exactly a typical, figure; and, to those who do not deem it an impropriety that the historian of literature should deviate into the contemporaneous, a study of the interactions between so individual a mind and the intellectual forces at work during the period must seem an undertaking promising not a little of interest and illumination. This promise Mr. Cheydleur's volume fulfills not quite so generously as could be wished. It offers a series of faithful *précis* of certain writings of Sorel, chronologically arranged, and suitably grouped into "periods." The account given of the main outlines of Sorel's intellectual development is clear enough. But there is little analysis and cross-examination of the author's thought, and no sufficient collation of the scattered materials into a single connected exposition. Nowhere, for example, will the reader clearly or comprehensively gather what the elements in Bergson's philosophy were which Sorel made his own, and into what specific ideas of Sorel's they were transformed. Nor does the study quite cover the ground, even in its own way. After the *Réflexions sur la violence*, perhaps the most characteristic and noteworthy of Sorel's writings is *Les illusions du progrès*; for those who are chiefly interested in literary history it is the most significant of all. Of the contents of this volume Mr. Cheydleur gives no account. In spite of these limitations, however, his work is by no means without value for the student of the author or of the period.

In its actuating ideas Sorel's thought is one phase of that contemporary neo-romanticism which dislikes to acknowledge its ancestry. Fundamental in him are half a dozen of the 'notes' of the